

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Claims 1-5 and 7-16 are pending. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Claims 7, 10, and 15 have been amended without introducing any new matter.

Claim 1 was provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of the copending Application No. 10/039, 580 filed on December 31, 2001. A terminal disclaimer under 37 C.F.R. §1.321(c) is submitted with the current response to obviate the rejection.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant has amended claim 1 to obviate the rejection. The amendment of claim 1 is supported by the Specification in at least Figure 3 and the corresponding description, such as paragraph [0030] on page 8 of the Specification. Therefore, claim 1 as amended complies with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,178 of Stracovsky et al. (“Stracovsky”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,128,702 of Saulsbury (“Saulsbury”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 sets forth the command sequencer and serializer unit to use a first plurality of address and command signals to generate a plurality of signals to be input to the memory module via a point-to-point interconnect between the command sequencer and serializer unit and the memory module, wherein the plurality of signals is fewer in number than the first plurality of address and command signals. In contrast, neither Stracovsky nor Saulsbury discloses such a limitation.

Stracovsky merely discloses that the command sequencer 116 uses the information provided by the LUT 118 in conjunction with the resource tags stored in the resource tag buffer 114 to properly sequence the command components 202-210 to form the sequenced command 220 (col. 9, lines 7-11). Moreover, nothing in Figure 1B of Stracovsky discloses, suggests, or implies that the command sequencer 116 uses a first plurality of address and command signals to generate a plurality of signals, wherein the plurality of signals is fewer in number than the first plurality of address and command signals.

Furthermore, Saulsbury fails to disclose a command sequencer and serializer unit to use a first plurality of address and command signals to generate a plurality of signals, wherein the plurality of signals is fewer in number than the first plurality of address and command signals. Therefore, neither Stracovsky nor Saulsbury discloses at least the above limitation set forth in claim 1. Claim 1 is patentable over Stracovsky in view of Saulsbury for at least this reason. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claims 2-5 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-5 are patentable over Stracovsky in view of Saulsbury for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claims 7, 10, and 15 are patentable over Stracovsky in view of Saulsbury for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claims 8-9, 11-14, and 16 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 7, 10, and 15, respectively. Therefore, claims 8-9, 11-14, and 16 are patentable over Stracovsky in

view of Saulsbury for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and the remarks and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested. Applicant submits that claims 1-5 and 7-16 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: August 24, 2004


Chui-kuu Teresa Wong
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300